



**U.S. Department of Justice**

Civil Division, Appellate Staff  
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Rm: 7531  
Washington, D.C. 20530

Tel: (202) 514-5089  
Fax: (202) 514-8151

November 8, 2004

Mr. Mark J. Langer  
Clerk, United States Court of Appeals  
for the District of Columbia Circuit  
United States Courthouse  
Room 5423  
Third & Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: Cobell v. Norton, Nos. 03-5262, 04-5084  
(Argued September 14, 2004, before Chief Judge Ginsburg and Circuit Judges  
Randolph and Rogers)

Dear Mr. Langer:

The government hereby responds to plaintiffs' October 27 letter submitted under Rule 28(j).

Plaintiffs call the Court's attention to a November 2003 Department of Interior publication entitled "Independent Auditors' Report on the U.S. Department of the Interior's Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Report on Performance and Accountability." They assert that this publication was "withheld" by Interior and "recently discovered by the Plaintiffs-Appellees." Letter at 1.

The cited report has not been "withheld" (*ibid.*). It is available to the public on Interior's website at Part 4 of <http://www.doi.gov/pfm/par2003>. See <http://www.doi.gov/pfm/new03.html>.

Plaintiffs wrongly suggest that the report newly reveals that Interior has not yet completed the "certification and accreditation" (C&A) process for all of its information technology (IT) systems under OMB Circular A-130. See Letter at 1. The government has never intimated otherwise. As noted in our August 25 submission, the record makes clear that, as of March 2004, Interior "ha[d] fully certified and accredited 30 of its systems and issued interim approval to operate for [an additional] 108 systems." JA1820. See also, e.g., Interior's Seventeenth Quarterly Report (May

2004) at p.6 ("Most major applications and general support systems have received an Interim Approval to Operate (IATO). Approximately 20% of Interior's major applications and general support systems have completed the C&A process.").

As in their previous filings, plaintiffs fail to distinguish between IT security in general and security of individual Indian trust data in particular. The report submitted by plaintiffs explicitly states that Interior "has established security processes and documentation for its Indian Trust systems that place the trust systems in a better information-security posture than the majority of other DOI information systems." Attachment 2, p.1.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER D. KEISLER  
Assistant Attorney General

GREGORY G. KATSAS  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

ROBERT E. KOPP  
MARK B. STERN  
THOMAS M. BONDY  
CHARLES W. SCARBOROUGH  
ALISA B. KLEIN  
Attorneys, Appellate Staff

cc: Elliott H. Levitas  
G. William Austin, III  
Dennis Marc Gingold  
Keith M. Harper  
Earl Old Person